### <u>REMARKS</u>

## Paragraph 1-3 of the Office Action

The drawings are objected under 37 CFR 1.83(a) and 37 CFR 1.121(d). The drawing must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims.

Replacement sheets are being provided with this response. As the specification fully describes the drawings, no new matter is being added. The applicant thanks the Examiner for examining the case as filed.

Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested by the applicant.

10

15

20

25

5

# Paragraphs 4, 9 and 10 of the Office Action

Claim 6 is objected to because of the following informalities: claim 6 recites "said pole". Claim 6 is a dependent claim from claim 5, which further limits the plate. Therefore, claim 6 should recite "said plate". To the degree that the applicant's invention is understood, claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Dussen et al., in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,850,959 to Miller.

The figures, as submitted, show a pole having a front side and a back side. The plate is attached to the back side which is opposite in relation to the rod which receives the tire. It is believed, therefore, that claim 6 was properly presented as are claims 7 and 8.

Claims 6, 7 and 8 each include a plate attached to the back side of the pole so that the pole is positioned between the plate and the tire when the tire is mounted on the rod. The plate is used as a step when the pole is placed in horizontal position. This allows for easy entrance into the back of vehicle even though the tire is present. Van Dusen includes no such panel so that when the tire is in a lowered position in that device, the tire will interfere with a person attempting to enter or reach into the back of a vehicle. As this element is missing from the prior art, it is believed that claims 1 and 8, and all claims depending from claim 1, are in condition for allowance.

The applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection.

30

## Paragraphs 7 and 8 of the Office Action

Claims 1=5 are rejected under 35-U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 5,469,998 to Van Dusen et al.

Claim 1 includes a mounting having a male and female hitches coupled together.

This allows applicant's device to be used for mounting a tire while still providing a female receiving hitch for hitching a trailer to a vehicle. The applicant's device, essentially, becomes a connector between a hitch receiver and a hitch. It is respectfully submitted to the Examiner that Van Dusen does not teach a male and female hitch coupled together and insertable into a hitch receiver but a male hitch extendable into a conventional hitch receiver. The Van Dusen device does not allow for the attachment of a trailer to the vehicle once the Van Dusen device is placed

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested by the applicant.

Date: 3/15/06

### **CONCLUSION**

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, early consideration and allowance of this application are most courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

10

Sean A. Kaufhold (Reg. No. 46,820)

P.O. Box 89626

15 Sioux Falls, SD 57109

(605) 334-1571 FAX (605) 334-1574